Sections in italics can be generic and are canned language.

TITLE PAGE

DECLARATION FOR THE (INTERIM) RECORD OF DECISION

The Declaration functions as the abstract and formal authorizing signature page for the Record of Decision (ROD).

Unit Name and Location

Operable Unit Name and Building Number

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Identification Number: OU-(insert number)

Savannah River Site

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Identification Number: SC1890008989

Aiken, South Carolina

United States Department of Energy

Include a paragraph that discusses the unit in terms of RCRA/CERCLA and Appendix C of the FFA.

If an interim action, include a paragraph that discusses the SRS RCRA permit modification process applicability to the interim action. For example, the following paragraph may be used:

An SRS RCRA permit modification is not required at this time since this is an interim action. However, the final permit modification will (1) include the final selection of remedial alternatives under RCRA, (2) be sought for the entire (insert operable unit name) with the final Statement of Basis/Proposed Plan (SB/PP), and (3) will include the necessary public involvement and regulatory approvals. This Interim Record of Decision (IROD) also satisfies the RCRA requirements for an Interim Measures Work Plan.

Statement of Basis and Purpose

This section should contain the factual and legal basis for the selected remedy. Insert the following language:

This decision document presents the selected remedy for the (insert operable unit name), in (insert location). The remedy (or interim remedy) was chosen in accordance with CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments Reauthorization Act (SARA), and,

to the extent practicable, the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP). This decision is based on the Administrative Record File for this site.

The State of South Carolina concurs with the selected remedy.

Assessment of the Site

Certify that the site poses a threat to public health, welfare, or the environment. Insert the following language:

The response action selected in this ROD (or IROD) is necessary to protect the public health or welfare or the environment from actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances into the environment.

Description of the Selected Remedy

Describe the major components of the selected remedy in a bullet fashion.

Describe how this operable unit addresses principal and low-level threats at the site (i.e., what is being treated, what is being contained, and what is the rationale for each).

Describe the scope and role of this operable unit within the overall site management strategy.

Statutory Determinations

If the selected remedy satisfies the CERCLA 121 preference for treatment as a principal element, use the following language:

The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with Federal and State requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action (unless justified by a waiver), and is cost-effective, and utilizes permanent solutions and alternative treatment (or resource recovery) technologies to the maximum extent practicable. This remedy also satisfies the statutory preference for treatment as a principal element of the remedy (i.e., reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of materials comprising principal threats through treatment).

If the selected remedy does not satisfy the preference for treatment as a principal element, use the following language:

The selected remedy is protective of human health and the environment, complies with Federal and State requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the remedial action (unless justified by a waiver), and is cost-effective. However, because treatment of the principal threats of the site was not found to be practicable, this remedy does not satisfy the statutory preference for treatment as a principal element.

If the five-year review is applicable, use the following language:

Because this remedy will result in hazardous substances remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, a review will be conducted within five years after initiation of remedial action to ensure that the remedy continues to provide adequate protection of human health and the environment.

If the five-year review is not applicable, use the following language:

Because this remedy will not result in hazardous substances remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, a five-year review will not be required for this remedial action.

For an interim action, use the following language:

This interim action is protective of human health and the environment, complies with Federal and State requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate to the limited-scope remedial action (unless justified by a waiver), and is cost-effective. This action is interim and is not intended to utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment (or resource recovery) technologies to the maximum extent practicable for this OU. [Note: where treatment is utilized, replace the prior sentence with the following sentence: *Although this interim action is not intended to fully address the statutory mandate for permanence and treatment to the maximum extent practicable, this interim action utilizes treatment and thus is in furtherance of that statutory mandate.*] *Because this action does not constitute the final remedy for the (insert OU name), the statutory preference for remedies that employ treatment that reduces toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element* [Note: Include if treatment is being used: *although partially addressed in this remedy*] *will be addressed by the final response action. Subsequent actions are planned to address fully the threats posed by the conditions at this OU.*

Because this remedy will result in hazardous substances remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, a review will be conducted to ensure that the remedy continues to provide adequate protection of human health and the environment within five years after commencement of the remedial action. Because this is an IROD, review of this OU and of this remedy will be continuing as US DOE continues to develop remedial alternatives for the (insert OU name).

For remedies that invoke an applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) waiver, please be sure to include a statement to that effect. For example, in the case of an action that invokes an MCL waiver, the following statement can be used:

An applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) waiver under §300.430(f)(1)(ii)(C) of the NCP for all groundwater constituents of concern (COCs) has been invoked because the selected remedy is an interim action measure that will become part of a total remedial action that will ultimately attain ARARs.

For remedies that include institutional controls, use the following language:

Per the US EPA – Region IV Land Use Controls (LUCs) Policy, a LUC Assurance Plan (LUCAP) for SRS has been developed and approved by the regulators. In addition, a LUC Implementation Plan (LUCIP) for the (insert site name) OU will be developed and submitted to the regulators for their approval with the post-ROD documentation. The LUCIP will detail how SRS will implement, maintain, and monitor the land use control elements of the (insert site name) OU preferred alternative to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.

In the long term, if the property is ever transferred to nonfederal ownership, the US Government will take those actions necessary pursuant to Section 120(h) of CERCLA. Those actions will include a deed notification disclosing former waste management and disposal activities as well as remedial actions taken on the site. The deed notification shall, in perpetuity, notify any potential purchaser that the property has been used for the management and disposal of waste. These requirements are also consistent with the intent of the RCRA deed notification requirements at final closure of a RCRA facility if contamination will remain at the unit.

The deed shall also include deed restrictions precluding residential use of the property. However, the need for these deed restrictions may be reevaluated at the time of transfer in the event that exposure assumptions differ and/or the residual contamination no longer poses an unacceptable risk under residential use. Any reevaluation of the need for the deed restrictions will be done through an amended ROD with US EPA and SCDHEC review and approval.

In addition, if the site is ever transferred to nonfederal ownership, a survey plat of the OU will be prepared, certified by a professional land surveyor, and recorded with the appropriate county recording agency.

Data Certification Checklist

The Declaration should certify that the following information is included in the ROD (or provide a brief explanation for why this information is not included).

This ROD (or IROD) provides the following information

- *COCs and their respective concentrations*
- *Baseline risk represented by the COCs*
- *Cleanup levels established for the COCs and the basis for the levels*
- *Current and future land and groundwater use assumptions used in the BRA and IROD*

- *Land and groundwater use that will be available at the site as a result of the selected remedy*

- *Estimated capital, operation and maintenance, and total present worth cost; discount rate; and the number of years over which the remedy cost estimates are projected*

- *Decision factor(s) that led to selecting the remedy (i.e., describe how the selected remedy provides the best balance of tradeoffs with respect to the balancing and modifying criteria)*

- *How source materials constituting principal threats are addressed*

Separate Page: Authorizing Signatures and Appropriate Titles

THE DECISION SUMMARY

The Decision Summary identifies the selected remedy and provides a substantive summary of the Administrative Record File that supports the remedy selection decision. Relevant information from technical source documents that support the decision should be summarized (e.g., RI/FS and risk assessment).

TITLE PAGE

DECISION SUMMARY TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

I. SAVANNAH RIVER SITE AND OPERABLE UNIT NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION

Unit Name, Location, and Brief Description

Operable Unit Name and Building Number

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) Identification Number: OU-(insert number)

Savannah River Site

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Identification Number: SC1890008989

Aiken, South Carolina

United States Department of Energy (USDOE)

Savannah River Site (SRS) occupies approximately 310 square miles of land adjacent to the Savannah River, principally in Aiken and Barnwell counties of South Carolina (Figure 1). SRS is located approximately 25 miles southeast of Augusta, Georgia, and 20 miles south of Aiken, South Carolina.

The USDOE owns SRS, which historically produced tritium, plutonium, and other special nuclear materials for national defense and the space program. Chemical and radioactive wastes are by-products of nuclear material production processes. Hazardous substances, as defined by the CERCLA, are currently present in the environment at SRS.

The Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) (FFA 1993) for SRS lists the (insert OU name) as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act/Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (RCRA/CERCLA) unit requiring further evaluation. The (insert OU name) required further evaluation through an investigation process that integrates and combines the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) process with the CERCLA remedial investigation (RI) process to determine the actual or potential impact to human health and the environment of releases of hazardous substances to the environment.

II. SITE AND OPERABLE UNIT COMPLIANCE HISTORY

SRS Operational and Compliance History

The primary mission of SRS has been to produce tritium, plutonium, and other special nuclear materials for our nation's defense programs. Production of nuclear materials for the defense program was discontinued in 1988. SRS has provided nuclear materials for the space program, as well as for medical, industrial, and research efforts up to the present. Chemical and radioactive wastes are byproducts of nuclear material production processes. These wastes have been treated, stored, and in some cases, disposed at SRS. Past disposal practices have resulted in soil and groundwater contamination.

Hazardous waste materials handled at SRS are managed under RCRA, a comprehensive law requiring responsible management of hazardous waste. Certain SRS activities require South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) operating or post-closure permits under RCRA. SRS received a RCRA hazardous waste permit from the SCDHEC, which was most recently renewed on September 5, 1995. Module IV of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) portion of the RCRA permit mandates corrective action requirements for non-regulated solid waste management units subject to RCRA 3004(u).

On December 21, 1989, SRS was included on the National Priorities List (NPL). The inclusion created a need to integrate the established RFI program with CERCLA requirements to provide for a focused environmental program. In accordance with Section 120 of CERCLA 42 USC Section 9620, USDOE has negotiated a FFA (FFA 1993) with United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and SCDHEC to coordinate remedial activities at SRS into one comprehensive strategy which fulfills these dual regulatory requirements. USDOE functions as the lead agency for remedial activities at SRS, with concurrence by the USEPA - Region IV and the SCDHEC.

Operable Unit Operational and Compliance History

Include maps, a site plan, or other graphical presentations, as appropriate.

Provide an overview of the site, including the following:

- Size of site (e.g., acres).
- Geographical and topographical information (e.g., surface waters, flood plains, wetlands).

Provide a description of surface and subsurface features (e.g., number and volume of tanks, lagoons, structures, and drums at the site).

Provide a brief description of operating history, how the unit received waste that led to the current problems.

Provide information on any removal and remedial actions conducted under CERCLA or other authorities.

III. HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Insert the following language:

Both RCRA and CERCLA require the public to be given an opportunity to review and comment on the draft permit modification and proposed remedial alternative. Public participation requirements are listed in South Carolina Hazardous Waste Management Regulation (SCHWMR) R.61-79.124 and Sections 113 and 117 of CERCLA 42 USC Sections 9613 and 9617. These requirements include establishment of an Administrative Record File that documents the investigation and selection of the remedial alternative for addressing the (insert operable unit name) soils and groundwater. The Administrative Record File must be established at or near the facility at issue. The SRS Public Involvement Plan (USDOE 1994) is designed to facilitate public involvement in the decision-making process for permitting, closure, and the selection of remedial alternatives. The SRS Public Involvement Plan addresses the requirements of RCRA, CERCLA, and the National Environmental Policy Act, 1969 (NEPA). SCHWMR R.61-79.124 and Section 117(a) of CERCLA, as amended, require the advertisement of the draft permit modification and notice of any proposed remedial action and provide the public an opportunity to participate in the selection of the remedial action. The (insert proposed plan document name), a part of the Administrative Record File, highlights key aspects of the investigation and identifies the preferred action for addressing the (insert operable unit name).

The FFA Administrative Record File, which contains the information pertaining to the selection of the response action, is available at the following locations:

US Department of Energy
Public Reading Room
Gregg-Graniteville Library
University of South Carolina – Aiken
171 University Parkway
Aiken, South Carolina 29801
(803) 641-3465

Thomas Cooper Library
Government Documents Department
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
(803) 777-4866

The RCRA Administrative Record File for SCDHEC is available for review by the public at the following locations:

The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
Bureau of Land and Waste Management
8901 Farrow Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29203
(803) 896-4000

Lower Savannah District Environmental Quality Control Office
218 Beaufort Street, Northeast
Aiken, South Carolina 29802
(803) 641-7670

[Note: Insert this paragraph for interim actions: *An SRS RCRA permit modification is not required at this time since this is an interim action. However, the final permit modification will (1) include the final selection of remedial alternatives under RCRA, (2) be sought for the entire (insert operable unit name) with the final Statement of Basis/Proposed Plan (SB/PP), and (3) will include the necessary public involvement and regulatory approvals. This Interim Record of Decision (IROD) also satisfies the RCRA requirements for an Interim Measures Work Plan.*]

The public was notified of the public comment period through mailings of the SRS Environmental Bulletin, a newsletter sent to citizens in South Carolina and Georgia, and through notices in the Aiken Standard, the Allendale Citizen Leader, the Augusta Chronicle, the Barnwell People-Sentinel, and The State newspaper. The public comment period was also announced local radio stations.

The SB/PP 45-day (or IAPP 30-day) public comment period began on (insert date) and ended on (insert date). A Responsiveness Summary, prepared to address any comments received during the public comment period, is provided in Appendix A of the ROD. It will also be available in the final RCRA permit.

If there were any SRS CAB activities or recommendations regarding the operable unit, include a summary in this section.

[Note: Delete RCRA time period and references to RCRA if a CERCLA only unit or an interim action.]

IV. SCOPE AND ROLE OF THE OPERABLE UNIT WITHIN THE SITE STRATEGY

RCRA/CERCLA Programs at SRS

RCRA/CERCLA units (including the (insert operable unit name)) at SRS are subject to a multi-stage RI process that integrates the requirements of RCRA and CERCLA as outlined in the FFA (FFA 1993). The RCRA/CERCLA processes are summarized below

- *investigation and characterization of potentially impacted environmental media (such as soil, groundwater, and surface water) comprising the waste site and surrounding areas*
- *evaluation of risk to human health and the local ecological community*
- *screening of possible remedial actions to identify the selected technology which will protect human health and the environment*
- *implementation of the selected alternative*
- *documentation that the remediation has been performed competently*
- *evaluation of the effectiveness of the technology*

The steps of this process are iterative in nature, and include decision points which require concurrence between USDOE as owner/manager, USEPA and SCDHEC as regulatory oversight agencies, and the public (see Figure (insert appropriate figure number)){insert the generic RCRA/CERCLA Logic flowchart}.

Operable Unit Remedial Strategy

This section should summarize the lead agency's overall strategy for remediating SRS and describe how the action fits into that overall strategy.

Identify the potentially impacted watershed

Describe the scope of the problems addressed by action(s)

Describe how this action relates to other actions taken at this unit and eventually the watershed (include purpose of each action and sequence of the action in relation to other OUs or the watershed)

V. OPERABLE UNIT CHARACTERISTICS

Provide operable unit characteristics including maps, figures, and photos as appropriate to depict the nature and extent of contamination. For an interim action, this section should focus on the description of those site or operable unit characteristics to be addressed by the interim remedy.

Conceptual Site Model for the (Insert Operable Unit Name)

Identify primary sources of contamination, contaminated media, migration pathways, exposure pathways, and potential receptors (insert the latest revision of the CSM).

Figure #. RCRA/CERCLA Logic and Documentation

Figure #. RCRA/CERCLA Logic and Documentation (continued)

Media Assessment

Briefly describe the investigation

Summarize the results of the investigation

Describe types of contamination by affected media (e.g., soils, vadose zone, groundwater) and by discrete unit (if appropriate) [e.g., Pit Soils, Sewer Line Soils, Groundwater, etc.]

- Identify whether RCRA listed or characteristic hazardous wastes are at the unit
- Quantity/volume of waste that need to be addressed
- Concentrations of contaminants of concern (COCs) in each medium

Identify principal and low-level threat wastes at the site (e.g., location of mobile/high toxicity source materials and non-mobile/low toxicity source material) [Note: Per USEPA guidance, some wastes can not be classified as either principal or low-level threats.]

Identify any other-site specific factors that may affect response actions at the site

Contaminant Transport Analysis

Describe location of contamination and known or potential routes of off-site migration including:

- Population and environmental areas that could be affected, if exposed
- Lateral and vertical extent of contamination
- Potential surface and subsurface pathways of migration

For sites with groundwater contamination, describe the following, if appropriate

- Aquifer(s) affected or threatened by site contamination, types of geologic materials, approximate depths, whether aquifer is confined or unconfined
- Groundwater flow directions within each aquifer and between aquifers and groundwater discharge locations (e.g., surface waters, wetlands, other aquifers)
- Confirmed or suspected presence and locations of non-aqueous phase liquids (NAPLs)
- If groundwater transport models were used to define fate and transport of COCs, identify the model used and assumptions

VI. CURRENT AND POTENTIAL FUTURE SITE AND RESOURCE USES

Land Uses

Describe current on-site land uses.

Describe reasonably anticipated future land uses and basis for future use assumptions

Groundwater Uses/Surface Water Uses

Describe current ground/surface water uses

Describe potential beneficial ground/surface water uses

If beneficial use is potential drinking water source, identify the appropriate time frame of projected future drinking water.

VII. SUMMARY OF OPERABLE UNIT RISKS

Baseline Risk Assessment

Summarize briefly the baseline risk assessment process utilizing text and table formats (see attached example tables and sample language). Also, provide an illustration depicting the risk and final COCs for affected pathways. This section should focus on the information that is driving the need for the specific response action described in the ROD. It is NOT necessarily a summary of the entire baseline risk assessment.

Human Health Assessment

For human health risks:

Identify the concentrations of COCs in each medium of exposure

Summarize the results of the exposure assessment, focus on pathways and scenarios driving the action

Summarize the results of the toxicity assessment for the COCs

Summarize the risk characterization for both current and future land use scenarios and identify major assumptions and sources of uncertainty (This is NOT a summary of the COC uncertainty discussion from the RFI/RI Report, but identification of uncertainties associated with the overall risk characterization.)

Ecological Risk Assessment

For ecological risks:

Identify the concentrations of COCs in each medium

Summarize the results of the exposure assessment

Summarize the results of the ecological effects assessment

Summarize the ecological risk characterization and identify major assumptions and sources of uncertainty (This is NOT a summary of the COC uncertainty discussion from the RFI/RI Report, but identification of uncertainties associated with the overall risk characterization.)

Summary of Contaminant Migration

Summarize the results of the soil leachability modeling, being sure to identify any CMCOCs that were identified

Principal Threat Source Material

Identify any principal or low-level threat material that exists at the unit.

Conclusion

Clearly present the basis for taking the response action at the waste unit, being sure to provide a list of the retained final COCs at the unit.

Be sure to include the following statement in this section:

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances from this unit, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD (or IROD), may present a current or potential threat to public health, welfare, or the environment.

For an interim action, this section should focus on risks addressed by the interim action and should provide the rationale for the limited scope of the action. The rationale can be supported by facts that indicate that temporary action is necessary to stabilize the site or a portion of the site, prevent further environmental degradation, or achieve significant risk reduction quickly while a final remedial solution is being developed. Qualitative risk information may be presented if quantitative risk information is not yet available. The more specific findings of the baseline risk assessment and the ultimate clean-up objectives (i.e., acceptable exposure levels) for the site or operable unit should be included in the subsequent final action ROD for the operable unit.

VIII. REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES AND REMEDIAL GOALS

Present a clear statement of the specific remedial action objectives (RAOs) for the operable unit or site (e.g., treatment of contaminated soils above health-based action levels, restoration of groundwater plume to drinking water standards, and containment of dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) source areas)

Discuss the basis and rationale for RAOs (e.g., current and reasonably anticipated future land use and potential beneficial groundwater use)

Explain how the RAOs address risks identified in the risk assessment (e.g., how will the risks driving the need for action be addressed by the response action)

Based upon the appropriate human health and ecological COCs, provide the remedial goals (RGs) for the operable unit (use tables and illustrations as appropriate)

Identify potential ARARs for all the options in a table format. The table can be included as an appendix to the ROD.

IX. DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The objective of this section is to provide a brief understanding of the remedial alternatives developed for the site.

Remedy Components, Common Elements, and Distinguishing Features of Each Alternative

Up front, provide the following information for each alternative:

- Estimated Present Value Cost
- Construction Time to Complete

Describe the remedy and provide a bulleted list of the major components of each alternative, as they logically occur in the remediation process. Describe common elements and distinguishing features unique to each response action. Examples of these include:

Treatment technologies and materials that will be used to address (e.g., principal threat

Containment components of remedy (e.g., engineering controls, cap, hydraulic barriers) and materials they will be used to address (e.g., low-level threat source materials, treatment residuals)

Institutional Controls (and entity responsible for implementing and maintaining them)

Operations and Maintenance (O & M) activities required to maintain the integrity of the remedy (e.g., cap maintenance)

Monitoring requirements

Key ARARs associated with each alternative

Long-term reliability of remedy (potential for remedy failure/replacement costs)

Quantity of untreated waste and treatment residuals to be disposed off-site or managed on-site in a containment system and degree of hazard remaining in such waste

Available land uses upon achieving remediation goals. Note timeframe to achieve goals (e.g., commercial or light industrial use available in 3 years when cleanup levels are achieved)

Available groundwater uses upon achieving remediation goals. Note timeframe to achieve goals (e.g., restricted use for industrial purposes in Technical Impracticability (TI) waiver zone, drinking water use in non-TI zone achieving cleanup levels in 100 years)

Other impacts or benefits associated with each alternative

For an interim action, this section should describe the limited alternatives (including the No Action alternative) that were considered for the interim action (generally three or fewer). Only those requirements that are ARARs for the limited-scope interim action should be incorporated into the description of alternatives.

X. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

Briefly compare the relative performance of each alternative against the others with respect to the nine evaluation criteria (summarize in a table if appropriate):

- Overall protection of human health and the environment
- Compliance with ARARs
- Long-term effectiveness and permanence
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment
- Short-term effectiveness
- Implementability
- Cost
- State acceptance
- Community acceptance

For an interim action, this section should be presented in light of the limited scope of the action. Evaluation criteria not relevant to evaluation of interim actions need not be addressed in detail. Rather, their irrelevance to the decision should be noted briefly.

XI. THE SELECTED REMEDY

Detailed Description of the Selected Remedy

Expand on the description of the Selected Remedy from that which was provided in the Description of Alternatives section

Mention that the remedy may change as a result of the remedial design or construction processes. Changes to the remedy described in the ROD will be documented in the Administrative Record utilizing a memo, an Explanation of Significant Difference, or ROD Amendment.

Cost Estimate for the Selected Remedy

Present a detailed, activity-based breakdown of the estimated costs associated with implementing and maintaining the remedy (include estimated capital, O & M, and present worth costs, and the number of years over which the remedy cost estimate is projected)

Estimated Outcomes of Selected Remedy

Brief description based on elements relevant to the unit.

Available land use(s) upon achieving remediation goals. Note timeframe to achieve goals (e.g., commercial or light industrial use available in 3 years when cleanup levels are achieved)

Available groundwater use(s) upon achieving remediation goals. Note timeframe to achieve goals (e.g., restricted use for industrial purposes in TI waiver zone, drinking water use in non-TI zone upon achieving cleanup levels in 100 years)

Final cleanup levels for each media (i.e., contaminant specific remediation goals), basis for cleanup levels, and risk at cleanup levels (if appropriate)

Anticipated environmental and ecological benefits (e.g., restoration of sensitive ecosystems, protection of endangered species, protection of wildlife populations, wetlands restoration)

XII. STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS

Explain how the remedy satisfies the requirements of Section 121 of CERCLA:

Protection of human health and the environment

Compliance with ARARs or justify a waiver (summarize in a table if appropriate)

Cost-effectiveness

Utilization of permanent solutions and alternative treatment (resource recovery) technologies to the maximum extent practicable (i.e., explain why the Selected Remedy represents the best options)

Preference for treatment as a principal element (or justify not meeting this preference)

Explain five-year ROD review requirements for the Selected Remedy

For an interim action, this section should address only those ARARs specific for this action (e.g., residuals management during implementation). The discussion under "utilization of permanent solutions and treatment to the maximum extent practicable" should indicate that the interim action is not designed or expected to be final, but that the selected remedy represents the best balance of trade-offs among the alternatives with respect to pertinent criteria, given the limited scope of the action. The discussion under the "preference of treatment" section should note that the preference will be addressed in the final decision document for the site or final operable unit, although treatment components "that support the preference" should be noted.

XIII. EXPLANATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

If there are significant changes in the selected remedy from the preferred alternative identified in the proposed plan, then

Discuss the preferred alternative originally presented in the proposed plan

Describe the significant changes in the selected remedy

Explain the rationale for the changes and how they could have been reasonably anticipated based on the information presented in the proposed plan

XIV. RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

The Responsiveness Summary serves the dual purposes of (1) presenting stakeholder concerns about the site and preferences regarding the remedial alternatives, and (2) explaining how those concerns were addressed and how the preferences were factored into the remedy selection process. This discussion should cross-reference sections of the Decision Summary that demonstrate how issues raised by the community have been addressed. SRS CAB recommendations or comments made during the public comment period should be summarized and responded to in the Responsiveness Summary.

This section should include the following statement:

The Responsiveness Summary is included as Appendix A of this document.

XV. POST-ROD DOCUMENT SCHEDULE AND DESCRIPTION

Identify by bullets the major post-ROD submittals and attach a schedule.

For a final ROD, this section should include explicit statements telling the reader when cleanup will start in the field and when cleanup is scheduled for completion.

For an IROD, this section should include explicit statements telling the reader when cleanup will start in the field, when cleanup is scheduled for completion, any needed statements about a final Corrective Measures Study/Focused Feasibility Study to arrive at a proposed final remedy for the site, a statement identifying the timing of the public comment period for the final proposed plan and when the final ROD is scheduled for approval.

XVI. REFERENCES

Provide the references that are listed in the ROD (or IROD).

APPENDIX A - RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Additional appendices can be added as needed.

TABLES AND TEXT REFERENCED IN SECTION VII. SUMMARY OF OPERABLE UNIT RISKS

Note: The tables and text were obtained from the following reference:

USEPA, 1999. *A Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documen*ts, United States Environmental Protection agency Solid Waste and Emergency Response, EPA 540-R-98-031, OSWER 9200.1-23P, PB98-963241, July 1999